



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,211	06/14/2001	Gavin Brebner	B-4213 618881-4	5120

7590 09/09/2004

LADAS & PARRY
Suite 2100
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,211

Applicant(s)

BREBNER ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 5, 8 - 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/01/02
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 19 are presented for examination.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the input manager must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the location-data input manager must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the location-data input manager must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the input subsystem must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the output subsystem must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the input manager preferentially

Art Unit: 2143

storing must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 6. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 6 and 7 have not been further treated on the merits.

Art Unit: 2143

8. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant states in claim 9, "...claim 8, wherein where the input...". This is improper English and can be cured if Applicant amends to, "...claim 8, wherein the input...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. Claims 1 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

10. The limitations of, "location-data input manager" and "input manager", are not found in the specification. There is no mention of a type of manager performing any of the tasks set forth in the claim language. The Examiner can only decipher that the server and/or printer is performing the tasks that the supposed "location-data input manager" and/or "input manager" are performing.

11. The limitations of, "the input manager preferentially storing", in claim 10 is not found in the specification. What is disclosed is the location server performing this act on page 7.

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2143

13. Claims 11 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

14. It is unclear as to where or what the “input subsystem” and “output subsystem” is and which components of the system it could be interpreted as.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1 – 5, 8 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (6748426) (hereinafter Shaffer) in view of Wolff (6738841) Nakatsuma et al. (6115132) (hereinafter Nakatsuma).

17. As per claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Shaffer teaches a hard-copy output device including:

18. a memory, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 2, “*database*”),

19. a location-data input for receiving location data via the wireless interface and storing location data in the memory, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 2, “*database*”),

Art Unit: 2143

20. a network interface, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 2, “*database*”), but does not specifically teach a location-data input manager,

21. a wireless interface for receiving data,

22. a location server for responding to client requests received via the network interface to return location information comprising, or derived from, the location data stored in memory.

23. Wolff teaches a wireless interface for receiving data, (e.g. col. 8, lines 48 – 68),

24. a location server for responding to client requests received via the network interface to return location information comprising, or derived from, the location data stored in memory, (e.g. col. 5, lines 33 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wolff with Shaffer because utilizing a wireless link to a printer gives a user the mobility to print data in any area that the printer and/or printer server can accommodate. Nakatsuma teaches a location-data input manager, (e.g. col. 7, lines 34 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nakatsuma with the combine system of Shaffer and Wolff because it would be more efficient for a system to utilize a manager to manage the users that are connected to the network and to queue printing jobs from those users.

25. As per claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Shaffer teaches the input is operative to cause the form of the received location data to be converted from a first form to a second form prior to storage in said memory, one of the first and second forms being a semantic location form and the other a form based on geographic coordinates, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 37, “*Linkage Key*”), but doesn’t specifically teach a manager. Nakatsuma teaches an input

Art Unit: 2143

manager, (e.g. col. 7, lines 34 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nakatsuma with the combine system of Shaffer and Wolff because of similar reasons stated above.

26. As per claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Shaffer teaches the input effects said conversion by using a conversion service which it contacts over the network, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 37, “*Linkage Key*”), but doesn’t specifically teach a manager. Nakatsuma teaches an input manager, (e.g. col. 7, lines 34 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nakatsuma with the combine system of Shaffer and Wolff because of similar reasons stated above.

27. As per claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Shaffer teaches the received location data includes a reliability indicator which the input device uses to determine whether or not to overwrite existing location data, if any, held in said memory, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 37), but doesn’t specifically teach a manager. Nakatsuma teaches an input manager, (e.g. col. 7, lines 34 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nakatsuma with the combine system of Shaffer and Wolff because of similar reasons stated above.

28. As per claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Shaffer teaches the input device decides to store the newly received location data, the related reliability indicator is also stored, the input device when determining whether to store newly received location data, taking account

Art Unit: 2143

of the relative reliabilities of the stored and newly received information as indicated by their related reliability indicators, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 37), but doesn't specifically teach a manager. Nakatsuma teaches an input manager, (e.g. col. 7, lines 34 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nakatsuma with the combine system of Shaffer and Wolff because of similar reasons stated above.

29. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Shaffer teaches said reliability indicator indicates whether the location data has been received directly from an entity with a primary source of location data or from an entity which itself received the data from another entity, the input device preferentially storing or retaining location data received directly from an entity with a primary source of location data, (e.g. col. 5, line 31 – col. 6, line 37), but doesn't specifically teach a manager. Nakatsuma teaches an input manager, (e.g. col. 7, lines 34 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Nakatsuma with the combine system of Shaffer and Wolff because of similar reasons stated above.

30. Claims 1, 2, 11 – 19 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2143

32. a. Lamming et al. U.S. Patent No. 5862321 discloses System and method for accessing and distributing electronic documents.
33. b. Shah U.S. Patent No. 6389461 discloses System and method for supplying and updating information from one or more works to one or more remote user devices in a readily accessible form, and remote user device for use therein.
34. c. McCain et al. U.S. Patent No. 6330482 discloses Communications, information, maintenance diagnostic and training system.
35. d. Sandelman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6211782 discloses Electronic message delivery system utilizable in the monitoring of remote equipment and method of same.
36. e. Keeney et al. U.S. Patent No. 6748471 discloses Methods and apparatus for requesting and receiving a print job via a printer polling device associated with a printer.
37. f. Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6012083 discloses Method and apparatus for document processing using agents to process transactions created based on document content.
38. g. Dervarics U.S. Patent No. 6553240 discloses Print option for WAP browsers.
39. h. Shimizu et al. U.S. Patent No. 6609162 discloses Data processing apparatus connected to a network connectable a plurality of devices.
40. i. Salgado et al. U.S. Patent No. 6614542 discloses Method and apparatus to improve system concurrency for a job using a set of commonly shared resources such that a specific resource is used only for a portion of the job.
41. j. Han U.S. Patent No. 6035205 discloses Apparatus and method for enhancing telephone call quality of facsimile system with wireless telephone function.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333.


The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER